DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 825 FL 020 644

AUTHOR Canales, JoAnn
TITLE Innovative Practices in the Identification of LEP Students.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 60p.; In: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement. Volumes 1 and 2. Proceedings of the National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues (2nd, Washington, DC, September 4-6, 1991); see FL 020 630.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Ability Identification; Classroom Observation Techniques; Cloze Procedure; Dictation; Elementary Secondary Education; Interviews; Language Proficiency; Language Tests; *Limited English Speaking; Second Language Instruction; *Student Evaluation; Student Needs

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to describe current practices in various states used to identify linguistically different students, provide a review of literature regarding recommended practices, and offer alternative practices for identifying linguistically different students. The paper provides an information base regarding current identification practices; suggests a way to systematically identify limited English proficient student using multiple criteria; and offers a paradigm that will allow the U.S. Department of Education and the various state departments of education to collect consistent data regarding the students in need of English language assistance. Two responses to the paper, one by Julia Lara, the other by Robert Rueda, are provided. (VWL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED349825

Innovative Practices in the Identification of LEP Students

JoAnn Canales
North Texas State University

The development of the paper was rather like *deja vu*. Since 1974, when I entered the public school system as a recent graduate of a Speech Pathology program, I had all the answers...until I started working with children in a Chapter 1 identified campus in a border town school district. Each year, teachers would refer entire classes to me, and I realized quickly that I did not have the slightest idea how to tell the difference between those in need of Speech Pathology services and those in need of English language development services.

Two decades later, we still wrestle with the same issues, and I submit to you that, given the background of the students now entering the public school system, more and more students will be in need of English language development/Speech Pathology services related to articulation and language disorders, regardless of their ethnic or linguistic background.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to describe current practices in various states used to identify linguistically different students, provide a review of the literature regarding recommended practices, and offer alternative practices for identifying linguistically different students. The expectation is that the information contained herein can serve multi-fold purposes:

1. provide an information base regarding current identification practices

2. suggest a way to systematically identify limited English proficient students using multiple criteria; and

3. offer a paradigm that will allow the United States Department of Education and the various state departments of education to collect consistent data regarding the students in need of English language assistance.

Methodology

To this end, in addition to a review of the literature, surveys were mailed to 17 states that provided a geographical representation of the eastern, heartland, and western regions as well as a multilingual and multicultural representation of the 17 states surveyed, 9 responded. These states graciously responded within a two-week time frame which is most deeply appreciated and acknowledged.

FL 020 644

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The recommendations in the section entitled "Paradigm for Determining English Language Assessment Needs" seeks to incorporate yet expand current practices extant in the various states. The intent is to make the modification of traditional practices more palatable and pragmatic which will enable practitioners to move toward the use of multiple criteria for identification and assessment of linguistically different students.

Review of Language Assessment Practices in Selected States

The purpose of the survey was to obtain data on the LEP population and the English speaking population by grade level with respect to ethnicity, language(s) spoken, and program offerings and to examine these data for any relational patterns between the size and the type of the LEP population versus the identification and assessment practices in the various states.

The limited information received as a result of the survey precluded making any generalizable observations. An attempt to utilize data provided by another national study (Olsen, 1991) yielded some discrepancies between data provided in the report and data provided by some of the states surveyed. Thus, efforts to address the intent of the survey were not very successful.

Sufficient information was provided, however, regarding the identification and assessment practices utilized to make the following observations:

Home Language Surveys (HLS) are used by each of the responding states as the initial screening instrument although the number of items on the HLS varied from state to state. Also, some states, such as New Mexico, use ethnicity as the identification criteria on the HLS and others use languages spoken. Variations in these instruments generate different kinds of information that can be collected regarding LEP populations. One additional factor that may be problematic in using this self-report type of instrument stems from misinformed parents or guardians who feel a need to misrepresent the native language spoken in the home. Such parents often feel that their children will be placed in programs that are not conducive to learning English if they respond truthfully on the HLS.

Standardized Achievement Tests (SATs) are used by every state, however, the cutoff score for identification, and exit criteria, varies between the 23rd percentile and the 40th percentile. This large discrepancy between cutoff scores will significantly impact on the number of LEP students identified per state.

Oral Language Proficiency Tests (OLPTs) are also used by every state although some states, such as New Mexico, limit their recommendations to four specifically listed OLPTs and others, such as Texas, list eight possible options. Inter- and intra-state variations in the OLPTs utilized also contribute to inconsistent identification and data collection practices because there is no correlation between the various instruments.

Some of the states suggest the use of optional criteria and merely list the possibilities, e.g., interviews, observations, and classroom performance, while other states (Louisiana, New Mexico) suggest specific interview techniques or checklists for specific performance behaviors. Regardless of the optional criteria used, the difficulty lies in that there is no apparent means of correlating performance on these alternative measures with their performance on the SATs or the OLPTs.

Additionally, many states allow each school district total autonomy regarding procedures utilized. This factor, coupled with the wide variation in practices, has implications for collecting consistent data regarding the number of LEP students, the kinds of languages spoken, and the level of assistance needed. Further, it makes it extremely difficult to conduct statewide or nationwide research on programs serving LEP students that will yield consistent, credible, and defensible data for decision makers in the field.

Recommended Integrative Approaches to Language Assessment

In reviewing the states' practices for identifying LEP students, two criteria surfaced repeatedly as being used extensively, although the manner in which these criteria were used varied. These two criteria are the standardized achievement tests and the oral language proficiency tests. Much has been written about the inadequacies of standardized achievement tests and oral language proficiency tests as measures of an individual's proficiency in English (Canales, 1990; TEA, 1988; Oller, 1973). Regardless of their shortcomings, to date, they have been widely used by the majority of the states as a basis for consistent measurement of students' linguistic performance. Since the 1970s, however, several options have been recommended that would provide practitioners with a more realistic and comprehensive assessment of an individual's English language proficiency (Canales, 1990; Erickson, 1981; Thonis, 1980; Oller, 1973). Some states reported using these measures, or at least recommending them as optional measures in their state publications.

These optional measures assess language proficiency while a student is engaged in a meaningful speech event. This is known as an *integrative* approach to language assessment because students utilize

several communication skills simultaneously. The use of these recommended measures to assess an individual's *integrative* use of language skills is necessary because, heretofore, primary measures of language assessment, namely SATs and OLPTs, have focused on discreet items of language proficiency, e.g, use of verb tense, use of correct vocabulary term. This process severely limits the amount of information regarding an individual's actual proficiency with a language because language usage:

1. is dynamic and contextually based (varies depending upon the situation, the speakers, and the topic)

2. is discursive (requires connected speech)

3. requires the use of integrative skills to achieve communicative competence.

This definition of language usage is predicated on a socio-linguistic theoretical base suggesting that language is more than just a sum of its discrete parts. The implication then is that language assessment instruments also need to follow a similar theoretical base, a practice that has historically been ignored in traditional language assessment procedures (Canales, 1990).

Language assessment instruments consistent with this philosophy are known as measures of integrative skills and include observation instruments (rating scales and checklists), interviews, dictation tests, and cloze instruments. A description of each follows.

Observation Instruments

Classroom observations of students interacting in various settings are the basis for determining students' linguistic proficiency. A student's linguistic performance in listening **and** speaking is rated on a five-point scale of proficiency, ranging from non-native speaker of English to proficient speaker of English, for each of the four linguistic subsystems -- graphophonemic (letters/sounds), lexicon (vocabulary), morphology (grammar), and semantics (syntax/meaning) (see Appendix A & B). These rating scales are completed by the classroom teacher after observing students in various classroom settings. Separate rating scales can also be completed for observations of casual, social interactions, such as playground or cafeteria talk. Appropriate completion of these rating scales requires that the classroom teacher have an understanding of the criteria used to rate each of the linguistic subsystems.

The behaviors on the rating scale can also be listed in a checklist format in increasing order of difficulty for ease in scoring and analysis.

Interviews

Structured interviews are developed and administered on an individual basis. Ideally, an examiner should conduct the interview while a language specialist transcribes the examinee's responses, noting the use of the four linguistic subsystems. The advantages of this kind of measure are that it can be individually tailored to the experiences of the examinee and it allows the examiner opportunities to explore an individual's knowledge of the language.

The disadvantages, however, are several. First, it usually requires two people to administer the interview, a skilled interviewer and a language specialist. Second, this interview scenario has the potential to distract the examinee and perhaps contribute to diminished responses because of intimidation, especially for young children. Third, individualized administration makes it a time-consuming procedure. Finally, without appropriate scaling criteria, interviews are unsuitable for widespread use in schools as a tool for identification and placement of students.

Dictation Tests

The examinee listens to text dictated from graded material and writes down what is heard. The premise for this measure of integrative skills is that the individual needs to have knowledge of the four linguistic subsystems in order to convert speech to print. The use of dictation tests is advantageous because they:

- are easily developed from material used in everyday classroom situations such as basal readers, science books, or social studies books;
- can be administered in a group setting; and
- do not require extensive specialized training to develop or administer.

The few disadvantages of dictation tests, which can occur in the administration phase and the scoring phase, are manageable if the examiner is aware of them. First, an examiner's dialectal differences may cause difficulties in transcribing speech to print, a problem that could be overcome by using a taped version of the dictation. A related problem, students' lack of familiarity with this type of test, can be mitigated with practice sessions prior to the **actual** dictation to be used as the measure of language proficiency.

Second, an examinee's unfamiliarity with all of the variations in spelling of English sounds may cause interference for the examinee

in converting speech to print, for example, writing "miss is esmith" for "Mrs. Smith," for example. This difficulty can be overcome by having the dictation tests scored by someone who knows the differences between the graphic and phonetic systems of the examinee's native language compared to the system in English.

Third, the dictation test requires that the individual being tested knows how to write and finally, appropriate criteria for scaling need to be developed as in the case of the interviews.

Cloze Instruments

The examinee is asked to complete a readability-graded passage from which words have been omitted at regular intervals (usually every fifth word). The premise of this procedure is that language is highly redundant, with many contextual clues that can inform the examinee of the appropriate missing words if that person has a command of the language being tested. Cloze instruments have been used for many years and validated by reading specialists. Administered and analyzed properly, the results of cloze tests will yield information regarding the examinee's level of facility with the text. Such information is useful in planning for students' instructional needs.

In addition to its instructional orientation, there are many advantages to this procedure. The test can be prepared easily using texts that students use in the classroom, thus making the assessment procedure a functional one. Further, the test can be administered in a group setting and quickly scored. If administered to native English speakers at the same grade level, their scores can serve as a basis of comparison for the non-native speakers' scores. Additionally, the construction, administration, and scoring of the cloze test do not require any extensive specialized training to use correctly.

The difficulty in implementing the use of integrative measures of English language proficiency lies in the lack of

- broad based acceptance with respect to their ease of development and administration,
- understanding of the breadth and depth of their usefulness, and
- standardized procedures for consistently collecting and correlating alternative data on students.

These factors preclude the use of 'integrative measure' data in making uniform decisions regarding the identification, placement, and exit needs of LEP students.

Following is a model for ameliorating this dilemma. The scope of the model, however, exceeds the traditional practice of identification and can be used to make decisions for placement and exit, as well. Use of this model consolidates the gathering of information for practitioners and enables them to make informed decisions regarding the needs of the linguistically different children.

Paradigm for Determining English Language Assistance Needs

The model mentioned above is a comprehensive process that identifies not only students in need of language assistance but the level of assistance needed as well. The process involves a systematic documentation of students' linguistic proficiency in formal and informal settings and academic and non-academic settings. In short, this process generates a profile of a student's needs for language assistance and thus, has been titled the English Language Assistance Needs (ELAN) Profile Chart. The ELAN Profile Chart enables practitioners to document data needed to appropriately meet the instructional needs of students and the programmatic needs of campuses.

There are specific steps that must be addressed prior to implementing the effective use of such a model. These steps include

- identifying **criteria** to be used,
- developing a **Likert rating** scale to accompany each criterion,
- determining the range of scores possible for each **category of need,** and
- designing and implementing the **training** necessary to institutionalize the process.

Specifically, each step entails the following considerations.

Criteria Development

A comprehensive assessment of a student's language assistance need(s) requires that data be gathered in three areas. These three sets of data include non-academic related **o**ral language proficiency data, **s**ocial data, and **a**cademic data (**OSA**). In each of these areas local/state education agencies have the flexibility to include as many options as are feasible to be undertaken. The important consideration is that each option be clearly delineated and available to all of the individuals involved to ensure consistency of implementation. Some of the examples of the types of options have been mentioned in the section entitled "Review of Language Assessment Practices in Se-

lected States" and discussed in the section entitled "Recommended Integrative Approaches to Language Assessment." These options, and others, are listed below along with a brief rationale for their utilization.

Oral Language Proficiency Data

Home Language Survey -- This serves as an initial screening and is currently used in many states. It can provide useful information regarding baseline data such as language(s) spoken in the home.

Oral Language Proficiency Test -- These prepackaged instruments provide inexperienced practitioners with baseline data regarding students' linguistic performance albeit minimal data.

Oral Language Interview Instruments -- These instruments enable interviewers to probe for information not readily accessible through pen and paper tests.

Observation Instruments -- Provide detailed, comprehensive data on students as they engage in actual speech events which minimize the intimidation factor present in other testing situations.

Social Data

Socio-Economic Status (SES) -- An often disregarded criterion, the SES of a student can offer valuable information regarding the amount of oral/aural stimulation received in the home. Typically, children from low to mid SES home environments are not likely to have

- engaged in much dialogue,
- been read to by their parents,
- or experienced summer camps, organized sports, or other similar experiences that help develop linguistic skills.

Schooling Experience -- This, too, is an often disregarded criterion. Information gained can inform practitioners about the possible level of skills learned in a formal school setting. If these skills are not continuously developed or are developed in a country other than that of the target community, students will need additional intervention services.

Observation Data -- This information obtained from the home and other social settings such as the playground, the cafeteria, etcetera can validate, or confirm, other data gathered.

Academic Data

Achievement Test -- Standardized achievement tests have been a primary source of data used by many states. As mentioned previously, however, the cut off score for eligibility has varied from state to state. Many states also use state-specific standardized tests. Unless these instruments are administered at each grade level, such instruments will not provide consistent data and, thus, are not recommended for use as criteria.

Cloze Test -- Used by many states, such instruments provide useful data regarding the students' language proficiency level with classroom text information that is the basis for participation and promotion in the schooling process. Its ease of administration and scoring make it a valuable criterion for consideration.

Six Weeks Grades -- This criterion provides formative data on students' performance and is the primary criterion used for promotion. The mean should be monitored during each six weeks across subject areas and the mean for the first five of the six weeks should be used as one of the criteria for assessing English language assistance needs. Individual school agencies need to establish specific subject areas to include in the mean.

Observation Data -- Checklists or rating scales utilizing specific performance criteria can provide information regarding students' use of language in contextual situations.

While the number of criteria suggested above may seem unreasonable, multiple data are necessary to develop a consistent and defensible process for documenting the identification, placement, and progress of LEP students and the benefit of effective programs needed to serve them.

Likert Rating Scale Development

The second necessary step in the process is the development of a rating scale for each criterion to be included in the ELAN Profile Chart (see Appendix O). A five-point scale is recommended to provide consistency across sites using a similar procedure. Following are examples of suggested scales as well as brief rationales/explanations for the descriptors accompanying each rating.

Home Language Survey

1 -- Only Native Language Spoken
2 -- Mostly Native Language Spoken
3 -- Native and English Languages Spoken
4 -- Mostly English Spoken
5 -- Only English Spoken

Most of the home language surveys presently used by state or local education agencies ask three to eight questions that would yield this information. Examples of some of the questions include,

- Which language did your child first learn to speak?
- What language does your child use most often at home?
- What language do you most often use to speak to your child?
- What language does the father speak to his child most of the time?
- What language does the child speak to his/her father most of the time?
- What language does the mother speak to her child most of the time?
- What language does the child speak to his/her mother most of the time?
- What language does your child speak to his/her brothers and sisters most of the time?
- What language does your child speak to his/her friends most of the time?

Oral Language Proficiency Instrument

1 -- Non-English Speaker
2 -- Extremely Limited English Proficiency
3 -- Limited English Proficiency
4 -- Near Native-Like English Proficiency
5 -- Fluent English, Native-Like Proficiency

The descriptors for this scale reflect those found in OLPTs adopted for state use. Each descriptor has a range of possible scores based on the students' performance on the test.

Oral Language Interview Instrument

1 -- 80-100 percent Native Language Responses
2 -- 50- 79 percent Native Language Responses
3 -- < 50 percent in either Language
4 -- 50- 79 percent English Language Responses
5 -- 80-100 percent English Language Responses

This scale can be applied to any interview instrument regardless of the number of items contained therein. While specific response criteria is not provided, the expectation is that the interviewer will have been appropriately trained to score acceptable responses.

Observation Data

1 -- Pre-Production Stage
2 -- Early Production Stage
3 -- Speech Emergence Stage
4 -- Intermediate Stage
5 -- Fluent Stage

These are widely used labels for the various stages of language development (references). Specific behaviors relevant to each of the stages can be found in Appendix C.

Socio-Economic Status

1 -- < $5,000
2 -- $5,000 - 10,000
3 -- 10,000 - 25,000
4 -- 25,000 - 35,000
5 -- 35,000 - 45,000

These ranges are partially arbitrarily based on the qualifications for free and reduced lunch as well as a general approximation of the relative cost of meeting the basic needs of a family versus the affordability of "frills."

> [Note: Perhaps a more precise scale can be determined using the current Poverty Level Index that considers the number of family members versus the income.]

Schooling Experience

1 -- No Previous Schooling or All English Program Only
2 -- Interrupted Schooling/Some ESL Instruction
3 -- Schooling in Other Countries
4 -- ESL program only since entering U.S. school system
5 -- Bilingual education program only since entering U.S. school system

This factor is critical to successful participation in the academic setting. Students with little or no previous formal schooling experiences or students placed in inappropriate programs will be in need of extensive linguistic and cultural education services.

Observation Data (Home, with friends)

1 -- Uses native language ONLY in all settings
2 -- Relies on native language in all settings
3 -- Uses the native language sparingly in all settings
4 -- Uses the English language with friends only
5 -- Uses the English language mostly in all settings

Knowledge of language use in various settings can also indicate the possible level of proficiency with respect to vocabulary development.

Standardized Achievement Data

1 -- < 20 %ile
2 -- 20-29 %ile
3 -- 30-40 %ile
4 -- 41-59 %ile
5 -- 60-80 %ile

The distribution of percentile points for each rating decreases from 20 to 9 because of the critical need to have a command of the language in order to perform well on these tests, recognizing of course that knowledge of the English language is not the only critical factor central to performing well on these measures. It should be noted that the ratings of 1 and 2 exceed the maximum cut-off scores found in states with large populations of linguistically different students, however, this type of scale can provide consistency in identification data and is thus presented as such.

Cloze Test

1 -- Raw Score of 0 - 20
2 -- Raw Score of 21 - 30
3 -- Raw Score of 31 - 40
4 -- Raw Score of 41 - 49
5 -- Raw Score of 50

Cloze measures can be statewide versions based on state adopted texts or local versions. Decisions will need to be made regarding which content areas to include as cloze texts.

Six Weeks Grades

1 -- <= 59
2 -- 60's
3 -- 70's
4 -- 80's
5 -- 90's

The six weeks grades for each of the content areas can be used as a formative measure to monitor additional needs for English language assistance. The mean of the six weeks grades for the first five six weeks, either for individual subject areas or across subject areas, is recommended to assist decision makers in the early identification of students in need of English language assistance for the subsequent school year. Subject areas to be considered for determining this mean should at least include Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies given the language demands of the disciplines.

Observation Data by Grade Level and Subject Area

1 -- Points, identifies
2 -- Names, lists
3 -- Describes, tells (simply)
4 -- Compares, describes (more complex)
5 -- Analyzes, synthesizes

Linguistic information obtained as students engage in academic work can be particularly insightful for making programmatic decisions for these students. This information can be obtained using checklists or rating instruments once the desired behaviors have been identified (see Appendices D-L).

The ratings for each criterion presented above can easily be recorded in sample charts provided in the Appendix section of this paper. Appendix M illustrates an **Individual** English Language Assistance Needs Profile Chart and Appendix N illustrates a **Campus** Language Assistance Needs Profile Chart for use in recording the pertinent data.

In some instances, decisions will need to be made regarding missing data or non-applicable data. Suggested for use are "M" for data that is **M**issing and "0" for data that is not applicable, so that it will not get factored into the total count. Comments about why the descriptors were not applicable would be helpful in informing future users of the data and alerting them to changes which may need to be made. This procedure will ensure consistency in and utility of data collected.

Distribution of Scores by Category of Need

Once the criteria and the ratings have been determined, the next step involves the distribution of the number of points possible into each of the categories of needs -- Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced. Given the descriptors attached to each rating, the greater the number of points accumulated per child, the greater the child's proficiency in the English language. In contrast, the fewer the number of

points accumulated for each child, the greater the demand for English language assistance. This inverse relationship between points accumulated versus need is consistent with current practices in the various states. Such that, if students are at a "Level 3," they are at the advanced, near proficiency stage, and if they are at a "Level 1," their proficiency in English is virtually non-existent.

To further illustrate this point, if 11 criteria are selected to include in the ELAN Profile Chart as suggested above, then the greatest number of points would equal 55 [5 (rating) x 11 (criteria)] and the least number of points possible would equal 11 [1 (rating) x 11 (criteria)]. An individual student can total less than 11 points if there are some data that are Not Applicable (see Note below). An example, of the distribution of points is provided below.

34 - 55 Advanced Stage (Total possible if student scores all 5s or some 5s & 4s)
23 - 33 Intermediate Stage (Total possible if student scores all 3s or some 3s and 2s)
00 - 22 Beginning Stage (Total possible if student scores all 2s or 1s)

[NOTE: A score of 0-10 might be possible if there were missing data. If the criterion was important enough to include, decision makers may want to monitor the student's performance until the necessary additional information is available.]

As with every process conceptualized for wide use, certain realities, such as lack of resources, often preclude the comprehensive and extensive use of recommended procedures. In those instances, the following alternative is offered:

1. Deduct five points per criterion omitted from the overall total and adjust the totals in the three categorical levels accordingly.

55 Total in example (11 criteria)
- 5 Oral language interview
- 5 Observation Data (Social)
45 New Total for 9 criteria

28 - 45 Advanced (Scored all 5s or some 5s & 4s)
19 - 27 Intermediate (Scored all 3s or some 3s and 2s)
00 - 18 Beginning (Scored all 2s or 1s, and possibly some 0s)

2. Add five points for each criterion included to the overall total and adjust the three categorical levels accordingly.

55 -- Total in example (11 criteria)
+ 5 -- State-wide test administered at each grade level
60 -- New Total for 12 criteria

37 - 60 Advanced (Scored all 5s or some 5s, 4s, & 3s)
25 - 36 Intermediate (Scored all 3s or some 3s and 2s)
00 - 24 Beginning (Scored all 2s or 1s, and possibly some 0s)

If the school records of students are unavailable due to high mobility factors or recent immigrant status, then certain criteria may be selected in order to identify language assistance needs upon the student's arrival. For example, the Home Language Survey, the Oral Language Proficiency Test, the Previous Schooling, and the Oral Interview data can all be obtained readily. The distribution of scores would then be adjusted accordingly so that decisions regarding need and placement could be made. This would ensure that the student received appropriate services pending the arrival or attainment of additional information such as SAT scores or grades.

Advantages of the ELAN Profile Chart

Although at first glance, the process may seem cumbersome, the ELAN Profile Chart has many potential advantages. Some of these advantages include:

Teacher judgment is systematically documented.

Comprehensive information regarding a student's language proficiency is uniformly documented and available for use by teachers or parents.

Needs assessment can be conducted during end of the year LPAC meetings which, in turn, can facilitate student and faculty assignments for successive years.

Consistency in the identification process is possible in that the categorization of English Assistance Needs levels are based on Likert scale totals with corresponding points of distribution regardless of the number of criterion used.

Autonomy and flexibility in the criteria to be utilized remain a viable option for the state and local education agencies yet enable the United States Department of Education and the state education agencies, respectively, to collect data on the number of students in need of language assistance.

Identification, placement, and exit criteria systematically documented enable Language Proficiency Assessment Committees to execute their responsibilities conscientiously, consistently, and equitably.

Paper work is reduced to a manageable level, utilizing the comprehensive ELAN Individual Profile Chart (see Appendix M) or the ELAN Campus Profile Chart (see Appendix N).

Future Directions

Four critical mega-steps, if you will, need to be accomplished in order to implement the use of an ELAN Profile Chart.

First, the criteria to be utilized must be determined, or developed as in the case of the observation instruments. **Second**, participants in the process will require training in the development and usage of the instruments. **Third**, the data collected annually should be evaluated quantitatively and qualitatively to assess any patterns and note any anomalies. **Fourth**, longitudinal data should be cross validated for accuracy so that adjustments in the Likert scales can be made accordingly.

WHEATLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEATLAND ORAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PLANNING

RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE - LISTENING

NAME_____ GRADE_____SCHOOL YEAR 19__ - 19__

SCHOOL_____ Context: __ Home __ Peers __ School Primary Language_____

Indicate the pupil's language competencies by circling the appropriate rating. Use RED in October; BLACK in May

	Phonology The Sound System		Vocabulary The Lexical System		Grammar/Syntax The Structural System		Semantics The Meaning System
5	Understands immediately all speech in any formal classroom or informal presentation	5	Understands words at a very advanced level within context of formal classroom instruction and informal situations	5	Understands large units of connected discourse presented rapidly and grasps easily necessary grammatical and syntactical cues	5	Understands all classroom instruction and informal conversation very well; obtains meaning from oral context immediately
4	Understands classroom instruction and informal speech at the normal rate of presentation	4	Understands words beyond the basic level necessary to manage classroom instruction	4	Understands complex sentences containing several ideas and given at the normal rate; has ordinary grasp of syntax and grammar	4	Understands classroom instruction and informal conversation and obtains meaning from spoken context; occasionally asks for repetition of materials
3	Understands most of what is said, but occasionally asks for repetition	3	Understands words basic to the formal instructional program	3	Can understand simple sentences of moderate length when given at a slow rate; usually grasps word order and grammatical cues	3	Understands ordinary classroom instruction and comprehends the context or daily activities at the level of an average native speaker
2	Can understand what is said if speech is slowly and carefully pronounced	2	Understands only those words related to simple classroom instructions and informal directions	2	Can understand very short, simple sentences, given at an abnormally slow rate of speed; has some difficulty with syntax and grammar	2	Understands some of what is said in class and comprehends the context of only very simple material when slowly presented
1	Has great difficulty understanding what is said and appears to confuse sounds	1	Understands only those words necessary to basic needs	1	Has great difficulty in understanding more than one word statements	1	Understands relatively little of what is said in class and does not obtain meaning from the context of orally presented material

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHEATLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

WHEATLAND ORAL LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PLANNING
EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE - SPEAKING FLUENCY

NAME_____ GRADE_____SCHOOL YEAR 19__ - 19__

SCHOOL_____ Context: __ Home __ Peers __ School Primary Language_____

Indicate the pupil's language competencies by circling the appropriate rating. Use RED in October; BLACK in May

	Phonology The Sound System		Vocabulary The Lexical System		Grammar/Syntax The Structural System		Semantics The Meaning System
5	Pronounces words and sentences without error and with the fluency of a native speaker of commensurate age	5	Has an excellent vocabulary; uses figurative language and idiomatic expressions with the ease and facility of a highly fluent native speaker	5	Speaks very fluently in the classroom and in informal settings; oral expression is comparable to the language proficiency of native speaker of commensurate age	5	Speaks in a totally comprehensible manner in any situation; fluency is that of a highly verbal native speaker
4	Pronounces words and sentences at a level comparable to the language skills of an average native speaker	4	Has an above average vocabulary; may occasionally use figurative language and idiomatic expressions of a native speaker	4	Speaks in a generally fluent manner in the classroom and in informal settings but may demonstrate occasional difficulty in expression or the influence of non-native speech	4	Speaks in a comprehensible manner; functions well in classroom and informal context with no errors or difficulty; performs at the level of an above average native speaker
3	Pronounces words and sentences in a manner that can be understood but there is evidence of occasional error or influence of non-native speech	3	Has a vocabulary estimated at an average level for a native speaker and can manage adequately the subject matter idioms and figurative language	3	Speaks fluently and can express ideas adequately in the classroom and other settings; language competency appears to be that of an average native speaker	3	Speaks in a reasonably understandable manner like that of an average native speaker and appears to make sense most of the time
2	Pronounces words and sentences which are not fully understood because of errors which may cause comprehension problems	2	Has a limited vocabulary; may experience difficulties in expressing ideas; does not use idiomatic or figurative language	2	Speaks haltingly and has some difficulty expressing ideas; makes many grammatical errors and is frequently unable to respond	2	Speaks in a manner which often cannot be clearly understood; does not appear to be expressing self in a comprehensible way
1	Pronounces words and sentences which cannot be understood at all	1	Vocabulary deficits result in the wrong use of words, idioms or figurative language; usually silent	1	Often silent; rarely speaks at all except in a very limited manner in informal settings only	1	Cannot express meaning in connected discourse at all; expressions are usually one or two words sometimes accompanied by gestures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Identifying & Instructing the LEP Student
(English as a Second Language)

Levels of Proficiency	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V
ESL Categories	Pre-Production Stage	Early Production Stage	Speech Emergence Stage	Intermediate Fluency Stage	Near Proficient
	Beginning		Intermediate		Near Proficient
L_2 Language Characteristics	- minimal comprehension - no verbal production - communicate with action and gestures	-limited comprehension -one/two word responses -short phrases	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech engage in conversation and produce connected narrative	-near proficient orally *very good comprehension *vocabulary approaches that of native speaker of same age *few, if any, errors in speech *understands and produces complex sentences expected of native speaker of same age -lack of experiences with written language -scores at or above 40th percentile on state approved achievement test
Performance Indicators	listen draw point select move choose mime act/act out match circle	name list label categorize group tell/say respond answer (1-2 words)	recall summarize retell describe define role play explain restate compare contrast	analyze evaluate create justify defend support debate	All performance indicators
Instructional Focus	* Develop listening comprehension * Build receptive vocabulary	* Expand receptive vocabulary * Design activities that motivate students to produce vocabulary and structures they already understand	* Continue to expand receptive vocabulary * Design activities to develop higher level of language use * Introduce language experience activities	* Continue to expand receptive vocabulary * Design activities to develop higher levels of language use in the content areas * Incorporate reading and writing activities into lessons	* Continue to expand receptive vocabulary * Design activities to develop higher levels of language use * Incorporate reading and writing into lessons * Introduce contrastive analysis * Introduce easy-to-read books * Provide teacher and peer support (e.g. cooperative learning)

Grade 5

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT(ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Raises visual of numeral (0-20) upon hearing name. Picks up objects and sorts into two groups: heavy/light, clean/dirty. Sorts three identical pictures into 3 categories: short, shorter, shortest and tall, taller, tallest. Matches appropriate numeral to picture of corresponding number of objects.	Sequences cards of numerals 0-20 from smaller to larger. Names appropriate numeral (0-10) upon seeing visual reflecting corresponding number of objects. Responds with "more than" or "less than" when shown two different numerals 0-10. Labels groups of objects with corresponding numeral. Names geometric figures.	Counts to 15. Associates appropriate numeral to corresponding picture of 10-15 objects. Identifies objects in the room with specific geometric shapes. Compares sets of two objects/persons for greater height and/or weight. Retells steps of addition/subtraction problem leading to solution. Demonstrates and explains concept of "greater than" and "less than" with two sets of objects.	Counts to 20. Associates appropriate numeral to corresponding picture of 15-20 objects. Makes a complete statement about the geometric shapes of various objects in the room/home/school. Examines three objects/persons and describes them in relation to one another. Reads and writes 0-20. Creates and solves oral word problems using objects.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Points to self upon hearing name called. Shows picture of appropriate family member upon hearing name. Shows age and ages to be with object counters. Raises hand when birthdate is called. Listens to simple directions and places object in appropriate position. Acts out one responsibility of family member names. Circles appropriate day on calendar upon hearing day of week.	Labels family positions in a personal photograph of own immediate family. Tells birth date. Tells current age and age to be next birthday. Responds with location word only when asked position of object to another. Names family member when household responsibility is given. Says days of week in order.	Describes self in relation to either family members. Explains past and future events in own life. Defines specific roles of various family members. Contrasts responsibilities of different family members. Answers with appropriate day when an event is described. Recalls at least three rules of the classroom. Explains location of objects in room.	Describes other family members in relation to self. Completes an open-ended statement about various family members. Creates and describes an imaginary birthday. Examines ways to obtain food and clothing. Supports need for protection against heat and cold. Compares and contrasts self to a favorite family member. Justifies need for two classroom rules. Explains need for safety practices.
SCIENCE	Points to the appropriate sense organ when cued orally as to its sense and function. Dramatizes an appropriate reaction to a visual depicting a weather situation. Moves or touches the appropriate body part when its name is stated. Chooses the appropriate sign "living" or "non-living" when shown various objects or plants/animals/people. Follows commands correctly involving body parts.	Names appropriate sense when cued verbally of function. States body part(s) responsible for each sense. Lists all body parts. Indicates with one/two words a weather term reflected by various visuals. Labels various pictures with terms: dirty/clean or safe/dangerous.	Describes weather of the day in a simple sentence. States one function of each of the five senses. Divides thing into categories of "living" and "non-living" while naming it. Explains how many of each body part an individual has. Tells about objects in the classroom/school/ home that represent terms clean or dirty or safe or dangerous.	Compares and contrasts today's and yesterdays weather. States one function performed by each of the body parts. Describes what the loss of a sense might be like. Develops criteria for identifying "living" and "non-living". Examines the advantages of good personal hygiene.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 1

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Holds up set when hearing numerals 0-20. Points to numbers 1-100 according to verbal cue. Selects largest or smallest number to 100 when asked. Holds up correct math symbol when asked. Shows penny, nickel, dime or quarter when asked. Picks out half of a group or region when asked. Tells place value of a 2-digit number.	States number from 0-20 when seeing set or numeral. Counts to 100. Writes numeral 1-100 upon hearing verbal cue. Names math symbols. Identifies penny, nickel, dime and quarter by stating correct name. Tells value of coins: penny, nickel, dime and quarter. Counts to five with ordinal numbers.	States steps to solving addition and subtraction problems with answer. Solves oral word problems using addition and subtraction. Tells time to the hour and half hour. Measures with non-standard units. Counts coins to 50 cents. Uses ordinal numbers though 5 in a simple sentence.	Creates and solves written word problems using addition and subtraction. Uses names of standard and non-standard measurement in a sentence. Recognizes ordinal numbers through 5 in their written form. Uses names of money denominations in a complete sentence.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Points to appropriate picture of family member when given verbal cue. Holds up pictures of school personnel when requested. Points to appropriate picture when given verbal cues of national/cultural symbols and holidays. Points north, south, east, west on a map according to verbal cue. Follows simple directions utilizing relative location (spatial) words. Acts out roles of family members and school personnel.	Names an appropriate family member when a visual is shown and corresponding role is stated. Says name of school personnel upon seeing visual and hearing role described. Answers "yes" or "no" if statements heard promote cooperation between friends and classmates. Names national/cultural symbols and holidays when shown appropriate pictures. States "north/south/east/west" while observing such direction.	Follows two consecutive directions. Tells the role of each family member in a simple sentence. States one job responsibility of each school employee. Lists basic needs of a family. Describes three ways to promote cooperation at work and play. Responds to questions about safety rules. Gives other directions using relative direction words.	Describes in detail an individual responsible for making home, school, and community better. Explains diversity among individuals, families, and cultures. Identifies ways that the physical environment affects how people live. Gives oral directions to others using north/south/east/west. Tells about safety practices personally used in getting to and from school.
SCIENCE	Raises hand when hearing name of living things. Points to picture of season according to verbal cue. Draws sky, sun, cloud, and water when requested. Points to weather pictures according to verbal cue. Touches sense organ when cued orally for name and function. Points to plant part as directed. Holds up magnet, mirror, magnifying lens when asked.	Responds "living/non-living" when seeing or hearing cue. names the four seasons. Lists what living things require to sustain life. Indicates "day/night" when shown various pictures. Answers simple questions about weather with one/two word responses. Names plant parts. Lists animals when cued with a visual reflective of a certain habitat.	Describes each of the seasons in a simple sentence. Observes and retells steps of a simple experiment. Tells the functions of the various sense organs. Identifies various animals with a brief description of each. Defines what each part of a plant contributes to its life. Describes a proper diet and a poor diet.	Justifies individual daily intake of food as a "proper diet". States the relationship between proper diet and good health. Explains how to care for a pet. Compares and contrasts the seasons. Defines opposite characteristics as rough/smooth and gives examples.

Grade 2

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Raises numeral card 1-999 upon hearing verbal cue. Shows one color card for odd numbers and another color card for even numbers. Nods "yes" to indicate "correct" when hearing answers to addition and subtractions facts to 19. Points to half, thirds, or fourths of shaded diagrams upon hearing verbal cue. Selects penny, nickel, dime, quarter or half dollar when asked. Groups objects by 2's, 3's, 4's, 5's, 10's.	States "smaller/larger/equal to" when asked to compare two numbers. Says "odd" or "even" when seeing or hearing numbers to 999. Counts by ordinal numbers through 10. Names coins and states their value. Gives the answer to addition and subtraction facts to 19. Identifies by name these symbols: +, -, =, >, <. names shaded diagrams by half, thirds, and fourths. Counts by 2's, 3's, 4's, 5's, and 10's.	Read equations indicating "larger than/smaller than/equal to". Verbalizes addition and subtraction facts with answers up to 19. Tells time to the quarter hour. Measures using standard units while naming unit of measurement. Counts money while making change. Uses a math concept related to the calendar in a simple sentence. States a math concept in a sentence as it relates to real-life experiences. Says a complete date, including month, day, and year.	Counts from 1-999. Explains concept of regrouping in own words. Uses math concepts to explain personal life experiences. Constructs and interprets simple graphs and tables. Expresses steps of an experience by using ordinal numbers (first, second).
SOCIAL STUDIES	Holds up picture of appropriate community helper according to verbal cue. Touches picture of facility or service available upon hearing name of place in community. Points to own country, state, and city on map when asked. Draws map symbols when given oral direction. Demonstrates appropriate response to simple classroom rules.	Names community members on picture cards. Gives name of community facility when a service is stated. Responds with one/two words to simple questions about community people, facilities, and services. Replies with "a need" or "a want" upon hearing statement indicative of either. States name of own country, state and city.	Gives an example of a rule and a law in a simple sentence. Names community members and the respective service each provides. Identifies groups in which people have specific roles. Uses map symbols and keys. Answers questions about services and facilities provided in the community.	Explains why society needs rules. Defines criteria for distinguishing between "a need" and "a want". Describes how the passage of time effects people and living things. Tells about one individual who has made a contribution to the community. Creates and tells about a new facility or service for the community.
SCIENCE	Shows appropriate picture of plant or animal when requested. Raises hand when hearing the name of living things. Points to pictures of energy sources when hearing verbal cue. Holds up appropriate food group card when hearing name of food. Points to appropriate picture of solid, liquid, or gas according to verbal cue. Selects correct environment picture card when hearing name of various animals.	Names plant or animal on picture card. Diagrams plant stages with simple directions. Sequences animal life steps with simple directions. States "solid/liquid/gas" upon hearing or seeing cue. names energy sources when shown pictures. Identifies orally appropriate food group when shown picture of various foods.	States the importance of water to living things in simple sentences. Answers questions about animals and their environment in complete sentences. Verbalizes the sequence of stages of plant and animal life. Makes a chart with food groups listing various foods in each category.	Classifies animals into environmental categories while describing each habitat. Compares prehistoric life to life today. Predicts outcomes in cause/effect situations. Describes the three states of matter. States the stages of plant and animal life using ordinal numbers throughout the sequence.

Grade 3

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, paint, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
MATHEMATICS	PRE-PRODUCTION Selects appropriate numeral (1 to 9,999) according to verbal cue. Points to appropriate math symbol upon hearing name of operation. Points to appropriate coin/paper money upon hearing name. Selects correct numerical answer to multiplication and division facts through 45 with verbal cuing. Chooses correct answer for multiples of 10 and 100 with verbal cuing. Place hands of clock on correct numbers for time stated. Recognizes appropriate devices for measuring.	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE Names numerals (1 to 9,999). States math operation (+, -, x, /) upon seeing a completed problem. Names different coins and paper money denominations. Verbalizes answer to multiplication and division facts through 45. States answer to problems involving multiples of 10 and 100. Tells time to the nearest hour. Labels and categorizes various devices for measuring with either traditional or metric systems.	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE Uses numerals orally (1 - 9,999) in context of a simple sentence. Explains math operation using name of math symbol. Counts change correctly. States answer to multiplication and division facts through 45. Verbalizes multiples by 10 and 100. Demonstrates commutative property. Tells time to five minute intervals. Compares and contrasts orally appropriate devices used to measure with traditional and metric systems.	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE Reads and writes numeral 1-9,999. Explains math operation involved for solution to 3-digit numerals. Counts change through addition and subtraction. Verbalizes multiplicand, multiplier and product of multiples through 45 and by 10 and 100. Defines commutative property. Describes in detail (5 min. intervals) all personal events of previous day. Measures using traditional and metric systems with appropriate devices.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Points to self upon hearing own cultural/ethnic group named. Draws land formation upon hearing geographic name. Shows labels "density/sparsity" of visual reflecting an area of the city. Observes pictures reflecting four different seasons. Points to forms of transportation upon hearing name. Follows map upon hearing simple spatial directions. Matches community workers with appropriate place of employment.	Responds with name of land formation upon seeing visual cue. Says "density" or "sparsity" upon seeing visual of a specific area of the city. Names the appropriate seasons when shown visual of weather. Identifies name of community worker upon seeing visual cue. Lists modes of transportation available in the region. Responds "right" or "wrong" when listening to directions from own home to school.	Gives name of friend and cultural ethnic group in a complete sentence. Describes location of home in relation to a specific land formation. Paraphrases meaning of population density/sparsity. Gives directions from home to a specific place in the city. Describes the job of one community helper. Recalls all forms of transportation describing a preference. Explains the meaning of pollution. Compares specific sites of the City in relation to periods of time.	Analyzes the advantages of the diverse ethnic population of the City/Region. Evaluates the contributions of one cultural group of the City/Region. Explains why land formations affect population density. Completes a sentence describing the function of a local government unit when hearing its name. Examines a map of the region describing key community places. Debates the advantages/disadvantages of major industry in the City/Region. Tells about favorite season of year.
SCIENCE	Points to appropriate plant or animal upon hearing name. Matches certain plant and animal population to their corresponding habitats. Circles objects that reflect a solid state, underlines pictures that are liquids, and puts an x over pictures of gases. Points to mountains, rocks, and soil in an appropriate picture. Selects food when called by name.	Labels appropriate animals as "extinct/endangered" upon hearing names. Names plants and/or animals that live in the natural habitat reflected by a picture. Categorizes numerous pictures as either solid, liquid, or gas. Groups food according to their major most common nutrient. Calls mountains, rocks, and soil by correct names in an appropriate picture.	Describes why a specific plant or animal is an endangered species. Paraphrases the natural habitat of two animals. States "photosynthesis" in three sentences. Recalls events estimating specific numbers and time. Defines a solid, a liquid, and a gas. Explains two simple machines. Compares and contrasts two animals. Describes favorite foods based on nutritive value.	Defends extinction of an endangered species. Defines an animal's habitat including climate, land formation, surroundings, plant life, and other animals. Describes in detail plant needs for proper growth. Justifies conservation practices. Analyzes criteria for a solid, a liquid, and a gas. Examines contributions of three major scientists.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 4

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
	PREPRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Selects appropriate numeral (1 - 99,999) according to verbal cue. Points to math symbol upon hearing name of a given operation (+, -, x, /). Shows correct answer with verbal cuing to multiplication and division facts through 10 x 10. Places hands of clock on correct numbers for each time stated. Points to appropriate coin with each verbal cue. Circles appropriate Roman Numeral upon hearing numerical name. Points to geometric component with verbal cue.	Names numerals (1-99,999). States correct math operation upon seeing a completed problem. Tells time upon seeing clock. Verbalizes correct answers to multiplication facts up to 100. Names all coins to make change. Gives appropriate names of geometric components. Restates Roman Numeral in Arabic terms. Labels a line, line segment, point, ray, and angle. Groups separately fractions, decimals, and whole numbers.	Uses numeral (1 - 99,999) in a simple sentence. Explains math operation using name of math symbol in explanation. Describes events with reference to specific time (hour and minutes). makes change with verbal explanation. Tells how solution to a fraction was achieved. Compares equivalent fractions. Identifies the quotient, divisor, dividend and remainder of completed division problems.	Reads and writes (1 - 99,999) in simple sentences. Justifies answer to math problem naming math symbol. Reads time to nearest minute. Examines incorrect change received. Reads thermometer to nearest 10 degrees. Describes math operation for solving problems with decimals (through hundredths).
SOCIAL STUDIES	Matches appropriate cultural group of region with verbal cue. Points to appropriate early inhabitant, explorer or missionary. Chooses appropriate geographical term for visual cue. Points to appropriate part of government upon hearing function. Identifies appropriate visual of a natural resource with verbal cue. Acts out a safety measure in response to hazard cue.	Names diverse cultural groups of region. Categorizes individuals into 3 groups: early inhabitants, explorers, or missionaries. Labels visual with appropriate geographical form. Labels appropriate part of government upon hearing function. Responds with one/two words to a hazard (help, run, stop).	Describes each cultural group in region with two simple sentences. Explains the life experiences of the early habitant, the explorer, and the missionary. Defines the major geographical terms/features. Tells the function of each part of state government. Role plays (verbal) reactions to safe/hazardous situations.	Examines in detail the contributions of one cultural group in region. Tells the autobiography of one early inhabitant, explorer, or missionary. Creates an undiscovered land mass and describes it with geographical terms. Describes the interrelationship of the parts of the state government. Analyzes appropriate/inappropriate reactions to safe/unsafe situations.
SCIENCE	Follows simple experiment directions. Identifies simple machines with verbal cue. Places the planets of the solar system in correct location to one another. Matches weather terms to appropriate visual cue. Draws appropriate body organ for each verbal cue. Points to appropriate material to construct an electrical current (battery, wire, bulb).	Names the planets of the solar system. Labels weather terms for each visual cue. Responds with correct name for various body organs. Lists all materials to construct an electrical current. Names simple machines.	Describes the solar system using appropriate planet names. Defines weather terms as air pressure, heat, cold, etc. Recalls component parts of major body organs. Explains how to construct an electrical current. Recalls major effects of drug abuse.	Describes why one has not yet gone to a particular planet. Justifies today's weather using weather terms. Analyzes functions of major body organs. Evaluates another's construction of an electrical current. Explains interrelationship between plants and animals.

Grade 5

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limit comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
MATHEMATICS	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE Holds up appropriate numeral card (1 - 100,000,000) according to cue. Points to place value (1 - 100,000,000) according to cue. Shows understanding of terms "decimal/fraction/whole number" by pointing according to verbal cue. Chooses appropriate fractional part of diagram when given oral cue. Draws parallel and perpendicular lines according to oral cue. Identifies parts of fraction (nominator and denominator and like/unlike denominators).	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE Names place value of ones, tens, hundreds, thousands. Responds orally with "fraction", "whole number", or "decimal" when shown flashcard. Responds orally with "greatest common factor" or "least common denominator" when given a list of numbers with one number shaded for distinction. Names fractional parts when shown shaded diagrams. Lists metric units of measurement from smallest to largest. Labels diameter and radius.	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE Restates numbers in expended notation. Renames improper fractions and mixed numerals. Tells weight of object measured on scale. Measures and reports diameters and radius of flat, round objects. Compares types of triangles. Reads selected numerals (1 - 100,000,000) aloud.	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE Describes the calculation of averages. Explains metric conversions. Explains use of protractor while measuring angles. Compares congruent, symmetric and similar polygons and segments. States all steps to solve a 3-place multiplication problem.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Matches cultural group card to correct name upon hearing verbal cue. Sequences in order first four periods of our country's history. Points to river, mountain, lake, ocean, and desert upon receiving verbal cue. Matches picture with name of natural resource. Matches capital with state. Selects correct map type when named.	Names periods of U.S. history in natural sequence from earliest to present times. Gives name of geographic features when shown various ones on a map. Lists major natural resources in the U.S. States capital when given state. Names types of maps. Lists major cultures of U.S. while matching a visual of a contribution or influence of each.	Explains the parts and functions of national government. Defines democracy and its principles in simple sentences. Compares the use of different types of maps. Defines "ecological balance" in a complete sentence. compares and contrasts two distinct periods of U.S. history.	Describes a favorite period of U.S. history. Supports the need for ecological balance. Analyzes the contributions and influences of U.S. diverse cultures. Defends democracy against other forms of government. Explains use of one specific map based on a purpose.
SCIENCE	Points to picture of energy source when given verbal cue (solar, nuclear). Chooses simple machine indicated by verbal cue. Selects appropriate picture of animal or plant when receiving verbal cue. Selects correct food group when given food name orally. Holds up visual of stage of life cycle of insect when hearing name.	Categorizes plants and animals by classification group. Names stages of photosynthesis when shown pictures. Labels stages of water cycle. Names planets in solar system. Labels stages of social insect life cycle. Names four food groups, giving an example of each.	Explain steps of scientific problem-solving in simple sentences. States the steps of scientific decision-making in complete simple sentences. List steps of performing an experiment. Defines energy, conservation and natural resource. Explains the use of each simple machine.	Compares science problem-solving and decision-making. Describes the characteristics of the solar system's celestial bodies. Explains the process of photosynthesis. Defends the need for conservation of energy and national resources. Creates a chart showing major developmental changes during puberty. Creates a balanced meal using major food groups in the rational for choice.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 6

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend support, debate, examine, compute, describe (detail)
	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Chooses correct category of whole number, fraction or decimal upon receiving verbal cue. Selects improper fractions or mixed numbers upon verbal cuing. Picks out correct percent indicated verbally, when given a choice on paper. Points out angle, segment, triangle, square, and circle when signaled verbally.	Round out whole numbers and decimals orally. Names information needed to determine volume of a box. Names information needed to determine area of circle. Changes fractions and decimals to percent orally, with flashcard cue. Gives metric measurements of length, capacity and mass. Reads temperature in degrees Celsius.	Explains rounding out of whole numbers and decimals. Explains reduction of fractions. Defines triangle, circle, segment, box and angle. Defines mass, capacity, length, and volume. Renames decimals as fractions and fractions as decimals.	Explains process of calculating area of circle. Describes process of calculating volume of a box. Compares ration to determine equivalence. Explains process of converting decimals and fractions to percents. Predicts probable outcomes when given simple situations.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Selects picture of natural resources according to verbal cue. Points out geographical features on a map when cued orally. Points to graph, chart, table or timeline when cued verbally. Identifies reference materials when called for such as atlas, dictionary, encyclopedia.	Names natural resources. Identifies geographical features on a map. Shows movement of people on a map according to directions given. Labels stages of trade development. Names reference materials used in social studies class. Lists characteristics of culture.	Lists the factors that constitute a political system. States the factors that constitute an economic system. Defines colonization, settlement, and civilization in own words. Provides examples of technology, politics, and economy in short sentences.	Describes how climate, natural resources, and physical features affect settlement (culture). Compares the colonization of U.S. with another country. Compares the technology of yesterday with that of today. Explains the use of map key or legend. Interprets information on a graph, chart, table, or timeline. Creates a timeline of trade development stages. Uses special maps and globe projections to acquire information.
SCIENCE	Sequences picture card events of a demonstration after observation. Identifies chart, graph, table and diagram by pointing following verbal cue. Copies chart, graph, table and diagram. Matches picture of animal/plant to appropriate name with verbal cuing. Points to male and female reproduction system, when asked verbally, on an anatomical chart.	Selects appropriate instrument after hearing description of purpose. Tells mass of length of object in metric units. Follows directions to perform simple investigations. names non-typical plants and animals when shown picture. Names organ systems.	Sequences the events of a teacher demonstration. Interprets simple graphs, charts, tables and diagrams to answer basic questions. Lists scientific instruments and their uses. Categorizes plants and animals into typical and non-typical types.	Gives directions for a simple investigation to another student. Creates a graph or chart based on information given. Describes the functions of various organ system. Differentiates between fact and opinion based on scientific method. Explains functions of male and female reproductive systems. Supports conclusions drawn with observations made.

Grade 7

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
MATHEMATICS	PRE PRODUCTION STAGE Selects correct power expressed by exponent with verbal cuing. Points to a fraction, whole number, mixed number, or percent according to oral directions. Identifies a correct number when asked "prime" or "composite". Holds up appropriate figure when asked for congruent, similar or 3-D figures. Points to correct spot on graph when orally given coordinates.	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE Responds orally with "fraction", "decimal", "mixed number", or "percent" when shown a flashcard. Categorizes a list of numbers under "prime" and "composite" headings. Identifies congruent, similar and 3-D figures orally when shown figure. Tells the length of an object in metric units. States the surface area of a 3-D figure.	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE Lists the information needed to calculate surface area. Restates fractions as decimals, and decimals as fractions. Restates decimals as percents and percents as decimals. Predicts outcome of a given situation. Locates information requested on a graph.	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE Explains the conversion of fractions to decimals and decimals to fractions. Describes the process of changing percent to decimal and decimal to percent. Describes the process of finding what percent one number is of another. Explains how to find the opposite of an integer. Outlines steps for finding the mean. Defines "prime" and "composite".
SOCIAL STUDIES	Selects appropriate picture when hearing geographical feature. Points to picture of map, globe, chart, or graph according to verbal cue. Selects correct symbol (predetermined when hearing the terms "social" (people), "political" (document), "economic" (money), "intellectual" (head), and "cultural" (flag). Acts out according to verbal cue "drawing", "modeling", "writing", "discussing", "reporting", and "dramatizing".	Sequences pictures of geographical changes upon hearing simple description. Responds with "yes" or "no" to questions posed orally about simple chart. Locates area on globe or map when asked orally. States "discussing", "reporting", "dramatization", "drawing", "modeling", or "writing" after seeing demonstration. Draws a replica of world culture today and a prediction of tomorrow's world culture.	Names the major geographic epochs. Distinguishes verbally between "prehistoric" vs "historic". Names significant geographic features. Defines "conflict" and "controversy". Makes a chart of several great ideas and inventions that have transcended time and place, including origin, function, importance. Names men and women who have made significant contributions while stating their contributions. Creates a chart depicting major geographical epochs.	Explains the geographic transition from prehistoric to historic times. Relates geographical features to development of civilization. Compares civilization of whole world with civilization of non-western world. Reports on a conflict or controversy between cultures or nations. Takes notes on information regarding U.S. political system - listing major characteristics. Diagrams the effect that technological change has on cultural change. Formulates questions regarding political system of another country.
SCIENCE	Points to correct picture upon hearing "living" or "non-living". Points to major parts of microscope according to verbal cue. Sequences pictures for properly using the microscope. Holds up correct numeral (1-4) upon hearing corresponding part of experiment.	States "living" or "non-living" when shown pictures. Identifies major parts of microscope. Name four parts of an experiment. Diagrams human activities and their effect on the environment. Follows directions for using a microscope.	Describes the parts of an experiment hypothesis, procedure, results, conclusion. Lists ways the environment effects human activity. Gives directions for using a microscope. Tells volume of object in metric units.	Describes "cooperative group behavior" in terms of class experiments. Collects data and organizes it in column or graph form. Explains the effect that human activity has on the environment. Defends the statement "We must appreciate and respect the environment now, or someday our carelessness will take its toll".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade 8

Integrated ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (ESL) in the Content Areas

PROFICIENCY	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV
LEP PUPIL DESCRIPTORS	-minimal comprehension -no verbal production	-limited comprehension -one/two word response	-increased comprehension -simple sentences -some errors in speech	-very good comprehension -more complex sentences -complex errors in speech
LEP PUPIL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	listen, draw, point, select, move, choose, mime, act/act out, match, circle	name, list, label, categorize, group, tell/say, respond, answer (with one/two words)	recall, summarize, retell, describe, define, role-play, explain, restate, compare, contrast	analyze, evaluate, create, justify, defend, support, debate, examine, complete, describe (detail)
	PRE-PRODUCTION STAGE	EARLY PRODUCTION STAGE	SPEECH EMERGENCE STAGE	INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY STAGE
MATHEMATICS	Points to correct numerical or algebraic expressions according to verbal cue. Selects circle, square, triangle or rectangle when hearing its name. Points to parallel or perpendicular line upon hearing oral cue. Locates spot on graph when hearing coordinates.	Selects correct number, written in science notation, upon hearing it. Responds with "yes" or "no" when given oral estimates of area, volume, mass and temperature. Estimates orally the area, volume, mass or temperature. Names geometric shapes - triangle, square, rectangle, circle. Labels parallel and perpendicular lines. Tells number of permutations or combinations. Identifies mean, median, and mode.	Reads numbers written in scientific notation. Lists steps for prime factorization. Provides information necessary to calculate area, volume, mass and temperature. Defines "circumference" in own words. Defines "parallelogram" in own words. Lists steps for finding circumference of a circle and area of a triangle and parallelogram. Locates information requested in graphs: mean, median, and mode.	Explains the simplification of a numerical and an algebraic expression. Interprets graphs to provide requested information in written form. Contrasts purpose of "mean", "median", and "mode". Describes the process for finding a square root.
SOCIAL STUDIES	Selects correct picture when given geographical feature orally. Points to appropriate picture when hearing name of cultural group in U.S. Responds with "yes" or "no" when shown the picture of a contributor to U.S. cultural development and a contribution picture, indicating match or no match.	Names men and women who have contributed to the U.S. upon hearing a specific contribution. Sequences pictures of cultural changes from Colonial to present day America while hearing a simple description. Shades in a map of the U.S. showing growth while hearing land acquisition story. Responds "yes" or "no" to statements relating to contributions of slave society to U.S. culture.	Creates a chart showing effect of geographical features on settlement patterns. Expresses reasons for exploration and colonization, as well as problems. Lists major features of the Constitution and values and beliefs the represent. Diagrams relationship between invention, technological change and social problems.	Compares and contrasts Colonial values with contemporary values. compares and contrasts two major periods in U.S. immigration. Writes a diary entry from the viewpoint of an immigrant, explaining problems he/she has faced. Describes the U.S economic structure and its role in world economics. Writes an essay on "The Role of the U.S. in the World Today: From a Global Perspective". Predicts what American culture will be like in the future.
SCIENCE	Performs an experiment with picture and simple verbal directions. Shows appropriate piece of equipment when cued verbally. Points to cardiovascular, reproductive and respiratory systems on an anatomical chart, according to verbal cue.	Performs an experiment with simple verbal directions. Follows simple oral directions for using science equipment. Pairs disease with appropriate system indicating place of occurrence. Names potential disease when hearing the name of an organ.	Lists methods and alternatives to conserve and preserve earth's physical properties. Performs experiment with written directions. Chooses manner in which data should be presented when given experiment situations. States the steps followed in an experiment. Charts systems and common problems/diseases.	Designs the experiment to test a hypothesis. Creates an information/instruction sheet for the use of science equipment. Expresses an opinion on a contemporary issue, supported by scientific knowledge. Justifies choice of data presentation tool.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Name of Student: _____

INDIVIDUAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE NEEDS FORM

Criteria	PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05
Home Language Survey														
OLPT														
Oral Lang. Interview														
Observation Data														
SES														
Schooling Experience														
Observation Data														
Achievement Test														
Cloze Test														
Six Wks. Grades														
Observation Data														
TOTAL Points														
Classification														
Parental Approval/Denial														

Campus _____
Grade Level _____

Campus English Language Assistance Needs Form

		Oral Language Criteria					Social Criteria				Academic Criteria						
Student	Lang.	Crit.1	Crit.2	Crit.3	Crit.4		Crit.1	Crit.2	Crit.3		Crit. 1	Crit.2	Crit.3	Crit.4	Total	Category	Parent A/D*

* Parental Approval (A)
Parental Denial (D)

Appendix O

Likert Rating Scale for Determining English Language Assistance Needs

Oral Language Proficiency Data

Home Language Survey

1 – Only Native Language Spoken
2 – Mostly Native Language Spoken
3 – Native and English Languages Spoken
4 – Mostly English Spoken
5 – Only English Spoken

Oral Language Proficiency Instrument

1 – Non-English Speaker
2 – Extremely Limited English Proficiency
3 – Limited English Proficiency
4 – Near Native-Like English Proficiency
5 – Fluent English, Native-Like Proficiency

Interview Instrument

1 – 80-100% Native Language Responses
2 – 50- 79% Native Language Responses
3 – < 50% in either Language
4 – 50- 79% English Language Responses
5 – 80-100% English Language Responses

Observation Data

1 – Pre-Production Stage
2 – Early Production Stage
3 – Speech Emergence Stage
4 – Intermediate Stage
5 – Fluent Stage

Academic Data

Standardized Achievement Data

1 - < 20 %ile
2 - 20-29 %ile
3 - 30-40 %ile
4 - 41-59 %ile
5 - 60-80 %ile

Cloze Test

1 – Raw Score of 0 - 20
2 – Raw Score of 21 - 30
3 – Raw Score of 31 - 40
4 – Raw Score of 41 - 49
5 – Raw Score of 50

Six Weeks Grades

1 – < = 59
2 – 60's
3 – 70's
4 – 80's
5 – 90's

Observation Data by Grade Level and Subject Area

1 – Points, identifies
2 – Names, lists
3 – Describes, tell (simply)
4 – Compares, describes (more complex)
5 – Analyzes, synthesizes

Social Data

Socio-Economic Status

1 – < $5,000
2 – $5,000 - 10,000
3 – 10,000 - 25,000
4 – 25,000 - 35,000
5 – 35,000 - 45,000

Schooling Experience

1 – No Previous Schooling or All English Program Only
2 – Interrupted Schooling/Some ESL Instruction
3 – Schooling in Other Countries
4 – ESL program only since entering U.S. school system
5 – Bilingual education program only since entering U.S. school system

Observation Data (Home, with friends)

1 – Uses native language ONLY in all settings
2 – Relies on native language in all settings
3 – Uses the native language sparingly in all settings
4 – Uses the English language with friends only
5 – Uses the English language mostly in all settings

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes

Acknowledgements to the following individuals for information contained in the Appendices and included in this paper.

Appendices A-B Dr. Eleanor Thonis
Appendices C-L Dr. Betty Mace-Matluck and the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Multifunctional Resource Center; Austin, Texas

References

Bernstein, D. K. (1989). Assessing children with limited English proficiency: Current perspectives. Topics in Language Disorders, 9, No. 3, 1989, pp. 15-20.

Canales, J. (1989). Assessment of language proficiency: Informing policy and practice. Focus. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Christner, C. & Baenen, N.R. (1988, April). Longitudinal effectiveness of pre-kindergarten programs: Different approaches. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA,.

Cummins, J. (1980) The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. NABE Journal, 3, 25-29.

Erickson, J. G. & Omark, D. R. (1981) Communication assessment of the bilingual bicultural child. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1972). The sociology of language. In P.P. Giglioli (Ed.), Language and social context. Great Britain: Penguin Books.

Hernandez-Chavez, E., Burt, M., & Dulay, H. (1978). Language dominance and proficiency testing: Some general considerations. NABE Journal, 3, (1).

Louisiana State Department of Education. (1991). Results of 1990-1991 survey of limited English proficient students.

Mace-Matluck, B. (1988) Consequences of exiting students too early from special language assistance programs. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

National Advisory and Coordinating Council on Bilingual Education. (1986). New directions in late '80s pursued (Tenth Annual Report, 1985-86). Washington DC: Author.

New Mexico State Department of Education. (1991). Annual report for limited English proficiency population, 1989-1990.

New York State Education Department. (1990). Guidelines for Programs Under Part 154 of Commissioner's Regulations for Pupils with Limited English Proficiency. Albany, NY: Author.

Oller, J. W. (1973). Discrete-point tests versus tests of integrative skills. In Focus on the learner: Pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Olson, R. E. (1989). Report of the limited English (LEP) student enrollment survey.

Olson, R. E. (1991). Report of the 1991 limited English proficient (LEP) student enrollment survey.

Personal correspondence Re: Information on LEP Student Eligibility and Language Assessment Practices. Georgia Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia, 1991.

Personal correspondence Re: Information on LEP Student Eligibility and Language Assessment Practices. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Quincy, Massachusetts, 1991.

Posner, B. et al. Dual Literacy Programs for LEP Students (Report). New York: New York City Board of Education, Division of High Schools.

Rasp, A., Jr., & Ensign, G. B., Jr. (1991). Washington State Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (Annual Evaluation Report, 1989-90).

Report of the Committee for the Evaluation of Language Assessment. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1977, 1979, 1983, 1985, 1988.

Rivera, C. (Ed.). (1984). Placement procedures in bilingual education and policy issues. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Rivera, C. & Simich, C. (1981). Issues in the Assessment of Language Proficiency of Language Minority Students. NABE Journal, 6, (1).

Smith, M. E. & Heflin, J. F. (1988, April). An analysis of ESL/bilingual education policy in Oregon school districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Texas State Education Agency. (1977, 1979, 1983, 1985, 1988). Report of the committee for the evaluation of language assessment. Austin: Author.

Texas State Education Agency. (1990). Data and information on the educational condition of limited English proficient students in Texas for the 1989-90 school year. Austin: Author.

Texas State Educational Agency. (1991). State board rules of education. Austin: Author.

Thonis, E. (1980, July). Language assessment: A malignant good. Speech delivered in Honolulu, Hawaii.

Ulibarri, D. M., Spencer, M.L. (1981). Language proficiency tests and their relationship to school ratings as predictors of academic achievement. NABE Journal, 3.

Utah State Office of Education. Survey form for data on limited English proficient students in public and private schools of Utah.

Wentling, R. M. (1985). Identification, assessment, and placement procedures used for limited English proficiency (LEP) students in vocational education programs. Journal of Vocational Education Research, 10, (1), 41-57.

Response to JoAnn Canales's Presentation

Julia Lara
Council of Chief State School Officers,
Washington, DC

The comments outlined below draw extensively from the work of Ed De Avila, and from a report recently completed by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) titled, "Recommendations for Improving the Assessment and Monitoring of Students with Limited English Proficiency".

The author of this paper should be commended for bridging the gap between our knowledge of socio-linguistic theory of language learning and the application of the principles of this theory to the assessment of limited English proficient students. There has been for a number of years agreement within the field concerning the need to encourage the use of integrative approaches to language assessment (observations, interviews, dictation, etcetera. However, as noted in the paper, these approaches can be costly and time consuming and consequently districts have been reticent to use these approaches extensively. Another key barrier preventing the use of these approaches has been the absence of an operational definition of a limited English proficiency student and of a fully English proficient student (see CCSSO document for conceptual definition of LEP and FEP)[1]. The methods of assessment outlined in the paper; the rating scales; and the social and academic data elements suggested are important elements of a comprehensive data collection system on LEP students.

However, there are a number of areas that need clarification and perhaps elaboration in this paper. The following comments discuss each of this areas of concern.

The discussion of state assessment and data collection practices is limited given the limited number of survey responses obtained by the author. A more extensive discussion of state assessment and data collection practices is contained in a publication by the CCSSO titled, "Summary of State Practices Concerning the Assessment of Data Collection about Limited English Proficient Students." This report lists on a state by state basis, the pre-screening, classification, placement, and exiting procedures and instruments used in each state, and types of instrument. The report also identifies data elements collected at the state level on LEP performance and academic status.

Differentiation needs to be made between procedures used for classification of language proficiency status from those to be used for

placement. It appears that the author suggests that integrative approaches used be used for purposes of classification along with the traditional oral language proficiency and achievement tests. While in the ideal situation this would be the best course of action to follow, we cannot loose sight of the realities (limitations in funding, personnel) at the local level, and the importance of identifying students within a reasonable period of time. In states with large numbers of LEP students, LEAs are advised to screen, classify, and place LEP students in language assistance programs within 30 days of enrollment. Districts in these states must use methods that are simple, effective, quick, and efficient. I am not convinced that, for purposes of classification, local practitioners can use all three assessment methods suggested (oral language proficiency tests, achievement tests and integrative tests) within 30 days or less. In spite of the limitations inherent in the language proficiency tests (do not measure all four language areas) districts may need to rely heavily on these instruments' use for purposes of classification[2]. However, it makes sense to use integrative approaches in borderline cases when student's score on the language proficiency tests are close to the cut-off point.

For purposes of placement, monitoring language development and mainstreaming LEP students into the English-Only classroom, it is essential that the communicative based approaches outlined in the model be used by classroom teachers on a consistent basis. These assessments are particularly important prior to decision-making points along the LEP student educational continuum. A review of state practices shows that, for placement purposes, no state requires the use of observations, although 33 states do recommend that these methods be used. In terms of interview methods in five states they are required, while in 23 states they are recommended. Unless these procedures are required by the state, it is difficult to sort out when and how districts use integrative approaches. It appears that in many instances, LEAs opt for the least expensive option. Thus, at the national level, we do not have a clear picture of local practice regarding use of various assessment instruments. However, we do know that LEAs with resources are more likely than others to use a variety of assessment methods for purposes of placement and exiting.

In terms of reclassification, there is no doubt that, at the classroom level, teachers need to have information about what students can and cannot do relative to the linguistic demands of the mainstream classroom. Without this normative information, placement decisions are likely to be made in isolation of the classroom context and may result in premature exiting of LEP students from the language support programs. Integrative methods are certainly the most valid mechanisms for providing information to teachers about student linguistic performance.

More needs to be said about issues of reliability. Some concerns have been raised about the extent to which rating scales can be applied systematically across various contexts. Ed DeAvila has noted in his writings that teacher rating is problematic because they are highly dependent on the teacher's language background, the teacher's familiarity with the child, and the teacher's knowledge of language development (Ed DeAvila, 1990). I am not certain that these concerns have been addressed by the model. Assessment experts may need to look more closely at this issue relative to the recommendations outlined in this paper.

The use of socio economic data for purposes of identification and placement can be misused. The author asserts that this information can be used as an indicator of "oral/aural stimulation received in the home" and subsequently suggests family income as the measure of SES. The relationship between lack of stimulation in the home and development of linguistic skills in the LEP students' first of second language needs further exploration. There is no direct relationship between poverty status and inability to learn a second language as there is between poverty and academic achievement (broadly defined). To imply that there might be a positive relationship between the two is to minimize the role of both the developing linguistic and literacy skills of LEP students independent of socio economic background. The author needs to strengthen the case for the use of SES as an important element of the profile and show how it bears on language learning.

In terms of data collection, the data elements contained in the ELAN profile will be useful in terms of classroom level instructional needs. However, for decision making at the state and local level, the data set needs to be more comprehensive. Administrators and decision makers need information that can be used for program evaluation/development purposes such as referrals to special education, placement in categorical programs, dropout rates, attendance, retention in grade and much more.

Finally, while this paper identified the key assessment methods essential for student identification, it did not outline how these various assessment methods would relate to each other and at what point in the educational experiences of the LEP student. Nonetheless, the ELAN Profile chart is a promising mechanism for decision making at the local level. With additional development it should be very useful to practitioners and to officials in state education agencies.

Notes

[1] The CCSSO publication cited above, "Recommendations for Improving....Limited English Proficiency," contains a definition for a limited English proficient student and for a fully English proficient student.

[2] Along with the information obtained in the screening devise, Home Language Survey.

Response to JoAnn Canales' Presentation

Robert Rueda
University of Southern California

The paper by Dr. JoAnn Canales on innovative practices in the identification of LEP students set out to accomplish three distinct goals. One was to provide information on current identification practices by state departments of education, including measures which they suggest or propose. A second goal was to present a way to systematically identify LEP students through the use of multiple alternative criteria. Finally, the last goal was to outline a paradigm that would permit state departments to collect consistent data for students in need of English language assistance. In preparing my comments, I have followed the order of the main points made in the paper, and therefore I will present those comments in that sequence. At the end of the commentary, I will present a set of suggestions for possible future drafts of the paper.

Current Practices

In order to provide data on current practices around the country, Dr. Canales conducted a survey in which seventeen states were contacted. Responses were received from eight of these states. Although there were practical constraints on collecting this data due to limited time, certain details were omitted from this early draft of the paper which would have been desirable from a methodological perspective. For example, it is not entirely clear exactly what the state department representatives were asked in terms of survey items. In addition, information about sampling would have been useful as well. For example, how were these seventeen states selected? In examining the states that responded, some of the states with significant numbers of language minority students were absent, including Florida, California, and Arizona. Since states vary significantly regarding proportions of language minority students, they are not all weighted equally in terms of importance, and it would be interesting to have additional data on what other states are doing. These limitations in terms of sampling need to be taken into account in interpreting the generalizability of the survey results.

Notwithstanding these potential limitations regarding generalizability, there appear to be two major findings which emerged from the survey. First, there is wide variation in terms of current state practices. This is not altogether surprising, however, it does suggest that aggregating data and arriving at a summary statement regarding national practices is not a simple or direct matter.

The second finding is that, if the measures the states are using are examined, in addition to the Home Language Survey which is used by almost all, there is a strong reliance on standardized tests and oral language proficiency tests. In attempting to evaluate this pattern, it is useful to ask what is currently known about language in terms of research and theory and then compare that with current practices.

Although the body of research on language and bilingualism is immense and complex, there are some generalizations which would likely result in wide agreement. For example, work in linguistics, anthropology, cross-cultural psychology, cognitive psychology, and other fields suggest that language use (and by extension, "proficiency") is context-sensitive and context-specific. Proficiency is no longer viewed as a fixed, invariant, "within-the-head" phenomenon. Secondly, language is inherently social. It is acquired and used in social settings for social purposes. Thirdly, language is acquired, not learned. That is, it is rare to see a parent saying to a child, "Today we are going to learn plurals" in the normal course of the day's activities. It is acquired in natural settings in the course of people's needs to accomplish specific social activities such as eating, dressing, and so forth.

Another thing which is known about language is that it is used in order to accomplish meaningful activities. That is, it is purposeful, a tool in order to accomplish everyday tasks. It is also a tool in the sense of being a sign system, which is used to mediate cognition. In this sense, there is an intriguing link between language and thought as Piaget, Vygotsky, and many others have noted. A final point about language is that it can be seen as an integrated part of a larger system of literacy. Therefore, if language is broadened to include written language and so forth, then perhaps the focus on oral language is overly narrow.

If the above generalizations about language are taken as a simplified summary of current views, and compared to the reported practices of state departments of education, there is not a great deal of correspondence or match. Specifically, the heavy reliance on standardized tests, achievement tests, and oral language proficiency measures as reported in the survey suggest that an outdated view of language is being used to drive practice.

Comments on an Alternative Model: The ELAN Profile Chart

Taking the same general points about language as a starting point, the author's proposed model can be compared to the generalizations described above as well. In the paper, Dr. Canales discussed

the theoretical base of the model as being sociolinguistic. As described in the paper, it is fairly consistent with the generalizations of language outlined earlier, certainly much closer than reported school practices.

The proposed model suggests that data be collected in three areas: oral language proficiency, social data, and academic data. The use of multiple evaluative criteria is suggested, and it is proposed that the scores can then be converted to Likert-scale ratings. From these converted ratings, a profile can be constructed and a classification derived, resulting in a designation of either advanced, intermediate, or beginning level.

Although the proposed model is certainly more comprehensive than what is currently being carried in many school districts, there are some components which might merit consideration for inclusion. One, for example, would be data on the affective state of the child with respect to first and second languages and their usage. As my colleague at USC, Steve Krashen suggests, the affective state of the child is important in terms of how rapid and effective the second language acquisition process is, and is an additional but important piece of data.

Another important piece of data of great interest would be the socio-political context in which the first and second languages are being or have been acquired. The relative status of L1 and L2 has an important impact on the child's acquisition of language, yet it is normally ignored in the assessment process because the focus is exclusively on the child.

A major component of the ELAN Profile Chart is the Likert-scale score conversions, which in essence is a data-reduction technique. That is, data from various types of proposed measures are converted to a five-point scale, making the data more comparable. However, when data is reduced by this or any other technique, precision is lost. As an example, a percentile score of 83.5 on a standardized measure, when converted to its transformed equivalent on a five point scale in order to make it more comparable to other data, loses some precision. This may be useful in aggregating and summarizing data across districts and/or states, however data is converted to an ordinal scale of measurement. That is, it is possible to say that a four is less than a five, but not how much more, and the distance between a three and a four, for example, may not be equivalent to the distance between a four and a five.

Another consideration in the proposed model is that equal weights are given to each of the proposed indicators, if my understanding is correct. Assuming that it is, this would suggest that the data from the Home Language Survey would be equivalent in impor-

tance to protracted observational data in a large number of contexts. Is it logical to equate the meaningfulness or usefulness of these distinctly different sources of data? I would suggest that this point is certainly open to question.

One of the curious aspects of the proposed ELAN Profile Chart is that many of the alternative measures proposed were already listed as options by many state departments of education. An important question, it seems, is why are states not using these measures already? These alternatives to standardized tests already exist and are available, suggesting that perhaps the development of completely new measures may not be what is needed in the assessment of LEP students. The alternatives which do exist are not extensively used, and I will return to this point shortly.

One point of contention with the proposed ELAN model would be the almost exclusive focus on oral language, more specifically English oral language. It seems this is overly restrictive in light of how language and literacy are currently viewed. From my perspective, it would be desirable to consider relative linguistic proficiency, not only in English but in the child's native language as well. Secondly, I would suggest broadening the scope to a wider focus on literacy as opposed to oral language exclusively. This might mean more attention to written language and other forms of literacy which are traditionally separated for assessment and instructional purposes. However, given the strong relationships among these, and the current view of language and literacy as part of a complex whole, separating out oral language from other parts of the child's development may not be the most advisable course.

A final point with respect to the ELAN model has to do with the distinction between classification and diagnosis. The former is the term for sorting and comparing students. That is, who is lower? Who is higher? Who goes into this group? Who goes into that group? The latter term, in contrast, refers to data used to derive intervention or treatment. The conceptual distinction between these two terms is often confused in discussions or assessment procedures. My understanding of the ELAN model suggests that it is concerned with the issue of classification. Certainly Likert-scale conversions will allow one to say who is higher and who is lower on one or more measures. However, data of this type are not terribly useful for day-to-day instructional decisions. Data of the type provided by converted standardized scores are severely limited. If the concern is "What does this child know and what is the next thing this child needs to work on?" For the practitioner needing to know, "What do I do with this particular child today?" Global comparative data does not provide a very specific answer. Simply put, I would like to argue for increased attention to instructional relevance and data more accessible to instructional personnel.

Considerations for Future Revisions

Obstacles to change. In this final section, I would like to provide some suggestions for consideration in future revisions to the paper presented. One critical question has to do with the obstacles to change in educational institutions. A great deal of attention is currently being given in assessment circles to alternatives to traditional standardized assessment, which many have described as problematic. Why is it, however, that even when alternatives are available they are not heavily used? I would like to propose two hypotheses which might merit consideration as alternative assessment models are developed and considered.

One hypothesis is that teachers, bilingual specialists, and other practitioners in school settings have a particular schema or mental model of assessment. That is, this mental model provides a unified, logical framework of thinking about what assessment is, why it is used, how it fits together with instruction, and so forth. One possibility is that the mental model of assessment embedded in schools is very different from that embedded in the work of those researchers and theoreticians concerned with developing alternative assessment models. However, these underlying assumptions and belief systems are rarely taken into account. Innovative practices which do not neatly fit into one's existing mental model are ignored or discarded. Simply put, it is not enough to develop and disseminate alternative assessment models or procedures without taking into account the existing belief structures of the "end users." When viewed in this perspective, the failure of school practitioners to incorporate new assessment developments is logical and understandable. Unfortunately, rather than examining test-users, research (mostly guided by a psychometric framework), has tended to concentrate on the technical characteristics or procedural aspects of the tests themselves with little attention to those who would use them. It is important to recognize that many of the new innovations in assessment methodology and theory are rooted in a different paradigmatic framework from that familiar to many practitioners.

A second hypothesis is based on Mehan's work on educational decision making in special education. In his ethnographic examination of the referral, assessment, and placement process, he found that decisions were rarely made on the basis of rational consideration of test data and other child-related characteristics, as is assumed to take place in current law. Rather, he found the process to be characterized by "social negotiation," trade-offs, and bargaining; A child's educational fate often depended upon these interpersonal negotiations among educational personnel. In trying to make sense of these findings, Mehan assumed that all the actors were not malicious or incompetent. Rather, he concluded that their behavior was rational given the "institutional constraints" under which they were forced to

operate: limited time, budgetary shortages, conflicting laws, and so forth. The conclusion was that these very powerful everyday constraints had an overwhelming impact on day-to-day behavior, and what appeared irrational on the surface actually made sense. By extension, it can be assumed that there are such constraints in institutional settings such as state departments of education, school districts, and individual classrooms which mitigate against change. These have yet to be studied, although it is possible that they exert significant pressure on the implementation of new assessment procedures.

The Larger Context of Assessment

One point that I would like to see addressed in this paper is increased consideration of recent developments regarding assessment at the national level. As an example, there is much talk about more authentic assessment to reflect closer alignment to authentic curriculum (c.f., the California Language Arts Framework) and to recent theories of cognition and learning. Portfolios and other innovations are being widely discussed, even as pressure is mounting for national indicators of performance. It is likely that the next few years may usher in significant change in how assessment is conceptualized and used because of events taking place at the national level. The work discussed in this present paper under consideration should not be treated in isolation from these developments, but rather should be considered within that larger context.

The issue of entry and exit. One factor which might merit further attention in future work on this topic is the whole issue of entry to and exit from bilingual programs. At present, it appears that schools operate from a rather inflexible, all-or-none system that is heavily reliant on standardized assessments. It would be useful to consider more flexibility within this system, especially since learning is not conceptualized in such an all-or-none fashion. How could alternative assessment for LEP students be restructured to assist in this process?

The issue of eligibility. Because of my background in special education, I have a special sensitivity to the whole issue of eligibility. This has been a central concern of the field, and I would like to hope that in the treatment of language minority students we learn from the mistakes which have been made. Historically, much attention has been placed on the question, Who has learning problems, and who does not? Who should receive services and who should be excluded? Tremendous amounts of scarce resources are spent on generating psychological reports and making complicated eligibility determinations. Entry into the system in most cases is dependent upon meeting a certain profile or criteria. In spite of the fact that the as-

sessment methodology and procedures are often technically inadequate, the field has focused on making finer and finer distinctions between groups of students at a tremendous cost. However, much of the assessment data collected during this sorting process does not readily translate into educational prescriptions. Moreover, many have argued that there are not really separate treatments for all the various diagnostic categories once they are filled.

The field of special education is currently in the midst of widespread controversy precisely because of these factors. It would be my hope that, in the field of bilingual education, we could avoid and even learn from some of these same mistakes. In order to meet these challenges, truly innovative developments are required at the level of assessment. However, it is not sufficient to consider the procedural aspects of new assessment methodologies apart from the new paradigms in which they are embedded or apart from the social contexts in which they will be used, that is, individual classrooms.